

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

May 10, 2011

The Edmonds City Council meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Mayor Cooper in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds. The meeting was opened with the flag salute.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Mike Cooper, Mayor
Strom Peterson, Council President
D. J. Wilson, Councilmember
Lora Petso, Councilmember
Diane Buckshnis, Councilmember
Steve Bernheim, Councilmember (arrived 7:20 p.m.)

ELECTED OFFICIALS ABSENT

Michael Plunkett, Councilmember
Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Councilmember

STAFF PRESENT

Al Compaan, Police Chief
Phil Williams, Public Works Director
Carrie Hite, Parks & Recreation Director
Carl Nelson, CIO
Debi Humann, Human Resources Director
Jim Tarte, Interim Finance Director
Jeff Taraday, City Attorney
Sandy Chase, City Clerk
Jana Spellman, Senior Executive Council Asst.
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

ALSO PRESENT

Peter Gibson, Student Representative

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COUNCILMEMBER WILSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA IN CONTENT AND ORDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Councilmember Bernheim was not present for the vote.)

2. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Councilmember Bernheim was not present for the vote.) The agenda items approved are as follows:

- A. ROLL CALL**
- B. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 2011.**
- C. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2011.**
- D. APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #125254 THROUGH #125384 DATED MAY 5, 2011 FOR \$433,592.90. APPROVAL OF PAYROLL DIRECT DEPOSIT AND CHECKS #50382 THROUGH #50414 FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 16, 2011 THROUGH APRIL 30, 2011 FOR \$643,323.84.**
- E. ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF CLAIM FOR DAMAGES SUBMITTED BY GEORGE PEPPIN (\$4,853.20).**

3. DISCUSSION OF LEVY OPTIONS.

Mayor Cooper advised the PowerPoint regarding the community survey will be posted on the City's website tomorrow.

Councilmember Wilson disclosed that Ms. Peters is a friend and he has worked with her in a professional capacity in the past.

COUNCILMEMBER WILSON WITHDREW HIS MOTION (MADE AT THE MAY 3, 2011 COUNCIL MEETING) WITH THE AGREEMENT OF THE SECOND.

Alison Peters, Alison Peters Consulting, suggested Council questions be held until following her presentation. She provided the City Clerk a binder with additional data.

Ms. Peters described her background, explaining she has been a pollster for approximately 15 years. She is from Washington State, done work in California and has owned her own business in the Puget Sound area for the past 9 years. She works almost exclusively in the public sector with cities, counties and special districts preparing to place measures on the ballot or assessing the feasibility of projects like this.

She explained the main questions the survey sought to answer were:

- How are residents feeling about the quality of life in Edmonds and the current pace of economic recovery?
- Are residents satisfied with City services and programs?
- What are the program and service priorities for residents in this economic climate?
- What is the reaction to hearing about a proposal for new operations revenue for the City?

She described the survey methodology:

- Research Technique: Telephone Interviewing
- Sample Type: All 7500+ registered voter households in Edmonds
- Field Dates: April 25-28, 2011
- Sample Size: N=400
- Survey Length: 14 minutes

Ms. Peters described the survey Demographics:

Gender		Aware of 2009 Public	
Male	45%	Yes, aware	32%
Female	55%	No, not aware	45%
		Unsure	23%
Age		Geography	
18-34	12%	NW region (Perrinville)	28%
35-44	11%	NE region (Meadowdale)	19%
45-59	29%	SW Region (City Center, Esperance	39%
60+	46%	SE region (SR99, Puget Drive	13%

Local Quality of Life and Economy

Q: Do things in Edmonds seem to be going in the right direction or does it feel things are off on the wrong track?

Right Direction	59%
Wrong Track	24%
Don't Know	17%
Edmonds residents are happy with the way things are going and their overall quality of life.	

	18-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-59 yrs	60+ yrs	Aware of 2009 Public Process	Unaware of 2009 Public Process
Right Direction	89%	48%	53%	57%	72%	45%
Wrong Track	9%	34%	30%	23%	16%	39%
Don't Know	2%	18%	17%	20%	12%	17%
The poll shows a correlation between age and perception of quality of life; informed residents are also more likely to indicate their satisfaction with how things are going						

	Perrinville	Meadowdale	City Center	SR99/Puget Drive
Right Direction	54%	59%	60%	63%
Wrong Track	25%	30%	25%	13%
Don't Know	21%	10%	15%	24%
The results show some differences by neighborhood and some places where residents may be less engaged on local issues. The Don't Know results show residents in Perrinville and SR99/Puget Drive need to be engaged.				

Q: Overall would you say the economy in this area is getting better, staying about the same, getting worse, don't know?

Getting Better	21%
Staying About the Same	56%
Getting Worse	20%
Don't Know	3%
Residents are neither very optimistic nor very pessimistic. Their answers reflect uncertainty. A greater percentage of people under 45 responded "staying the same" as they may be more affected by the economy.	

Q: We want you to evaluate the City Council, city leaders and city staff in several areas. Please respond to the following items using a scale of 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent).

	Overall Rating (1-5)
The job the Edmonds Police Department is doing to maintain public safety	4.19
The job the City is doing maintaining parks, trails, etc.	3.99
The job the City is doing maintaining public facilities and local streets	3.42
The communications you receive from the City	2.90
The job the City is doing spending tax dollars wisely and being transparent	2.88

Over 70% of residents offer ratings of 4 or 5 to both the Police and Parks Departments.

	Perrinville	Meadowdale	Downtown	SR99/ Puget Dr
The job the Edmonds Police Department is doing to maintain public safety	4.11	4.16	4.20	4.30
The job the City is doing maintaining parks, trails, etc	3.98	3.82	4.04	4.10
The job the City is doing maintaining public facilities and local streets	3.45	3.32	3.38	3.66
The communications you receive from the City	3.00	2.55	3.06	2.80
The job the City is doing spending tax dollars wisely and being transparent	2.92	2.70	2.85	3.08
Residents in the SE neighborhoods were noteworthy for the high ratings they gave to Public Works and Finance; Meadowdale residents gave low scores to Communications and Finance.				

Ms. Peters referred to the Executive Summary that includes key findings. She pointed out one of the key findings: residents hold different beliefs about the state of the local economy and the quality of life in Edmonds. It is possible to have a very high perception of the quality of services and still feel the economy is poor.

Awareness of City Finances and Past Public Involvement Efforts:

Ms. Peters urged the Council to pay the most attention to this section of questions.

Q: Have City leaders engage community leaders and members of the public to address the revenue shortfall over the past two years and move forward toward a solution?

Yes	32%
No	45%
Don't Know	23%
The key to analyzing this question is seeing who knew of the 2009 process and what impact that has on their attitudes.	

Aware of Process	Unaware of Process	Unsure
18-34 years = 42%	SE region = 55%	Women = 28%
Men under 45 = 39%	35 to 44 yrs = 63%	Women over 45 = 28%
Men over 45 = 38%	Women under 45 = 52%	
The largest population in Edmonds, including residents over 60, women over 45 and residents living in the downtown core, were not proportionately engaged in 2009 or perhaps don't recall what impact the process made on them.		

Q: Based on what you know, do you think the City is able to fund all city services and programs with its current revenue?

Yes	36%
No	50%
Don't Know	14%
Slightly more than a third (36%) of residents said the City can fund all programs and services with existing revenue; 50% disagree.	

Subgroups that think the City's revenue can fund all services:

- Overall 36%
- SE region 40%
- Men 44%
- 35 to 44 yrs 50%
- 18 to 34 yrs 51%
- Men < 45 62%

Q: Do you think the City has a "revenue problem" and needs new sources of funding or a "spending problem" and can still do more to become more efficient?

Revenue Problem	35%
Spending Problem	51%
Don't Know	14%
A bigger problem: The perception that overspending is the issue, not the tax system or the economy. In response to the previous question, 36% said the City is able to fund all City services and programs with its current revenue; in this question 51% say the City has a "spending problem."	

Subgroups that think the City has a "spending problem:"

- Overall 51%
- 45-59 yrs 56%
- Women Under 45 56%
- Unaware of 2009 process 58%
- Men under 45 65%

Service Priorities

Q: Which of the following is more important to you right now?

Keep taxes as they are	19%	42%
Keep tax as they are even if services are cut	23%	
Shore up the budget and maintain services	29%	52%
Get going on maintenance projects	23%	
Don't know	5%	
A majority of residents want to ensure a stable City budget and better funded basic services.		

Ms. Peters clarified at this point in the survey the concept of a levy had not yet been introduced.

Subgroups expressing a priority for “shoring up the budget:”

- Women over 45 38%
- SW region 36%
- Women 35%
- Overall 29%

	Keep Rates as they are	Move Forward
Women under 45	23%	66%
18-34 yrs	32%	67%
Women	35%	59%
Downtown	36%	57%
Women over 45	37%	58%
SR99/Puget Drive	38%	57%
Meadowdale	41%	57%
Men Over 45	50%	44%
Men	51%	42%
Men under 45	57%	43%
35 to 44 yrs	52%	38%
Perrinville	55%	40%
The gender gap is the most significant reason for the overall split in public opinion on this issue.		

Q: Later this year the City is considering an operations levy...” Do you think this proposal is a good idea or a bad idea?

Good Idea	52%
Bad Idea	43%
Don’t Know	5%
52% of residents have an early positive response to the proposal. This mirrors the response to a previous question regarding what is important to you.	

	Men <45	Men >45	Women <45	Women >45	Aware	Unaware	DK
Good Idea	43%	50%	63%	53%	60%	41%	62%
Bad Idea	48%	45%	37%	42%	34%	56%	32%
Move Forward	43%	44%	66%	58%	57%	49%	51%
Keep Rates	57%	50%	23%	37%	40%	46%	39%
% Change	0	+ 6 pts	-3 pts	-5 pts	+3pts	-8 pts	+11 pts

Q: I’m going to describe five ongoing needs within the City and I’d like you to tell me which one is your top priority area for funding.

Need	2nd priority	Top priority
\$700,000 would pay for local street maintenance projects	27%	26%

\$1.1 million per year would shore up the budget	19%	29%
\$100,000 per year would pay for maintenance of city parks, etc.	21%	24%
\$210,000 per year would pay for public safety	24%	20%
\$150,000 per year would pay for arts program	8%	1%
Budget stability and Public Works are top priorities		

	Perrinville	Meadowdale	Downtown	SR99/ Puget Dr
\$700k for Public Works	54%	62%	48%	45%
\$1.1M for budget	44%	42%	55%	44%
\$100k for parks	42%	43%	49%	47%
\$210k for public safety	51%	45%	38%	50%
Neighborhood priorities vary widely – both in terms of projects and the intensity expressed by residents.				

Evaluating the Options

Ms. Peters relayed a statement from a real estate website regarding Edmonds: “The number of adults working in math and technology in Edmonds is higher than in 95% of US cities.” This reflects the amount of thought, logic and the methodical approach to assessing the survey information. Residents react to well-reasoned information, not emotion.

Q: I'd like to know if these statements are important to you or not in evaluating this project.

More Important
City acknowledged people are worried about economy
City completes its strategic plan
Levy creates a cash reserve
The cost of delaying street maintenance (\$5M per year)
Economy is tough
Council needs to unify around the package
Levy should be for maintenance needs only

Less Important
Parks, pool and Flower Program deserve stable funding
City employees have been cutting back
Other revenue (casinos, retail) doesn't fit our values
Delaying projects will make them more expensive
Perhaps if we wait, the economy will bounce back making the levy unnecessary

	Somewhat important	Very Important
City should complete Strategic Plan first	18%	70%
City leaders understand that many people are worried about economy	26%	64%
City must stay true to its values	20%	56%
City Council needs to support the levy	25%	53%
Doesn't make sense to raise taxes in this economy	29%	51%
The levy creates a cash reserve	33%	48%

The parks system deserves secure funding	30%	47%
Projects should be maintenance only	30%	47%
City has been cutting back	34%	43%
Wait until economy rebounds	24%	41%
Street projects will be 3x to complete later	35%	40%
The current need to repair streets will grow if we delay	42%	39%

Ms. Peters commented on four pieces of information that work well together when considering next steps: appreciate, vision, plan and stand with us.

Q: We would like to know what you think about various options.

Should a measure combine projects into a single package or separate projects into individual ballot measure?	Residents prefer separate measures to a single package (62% to 31%)	-35 to 44 yrs old (78% separate) -People unaware of 2009 public process (73% separate) - SE region (39% single) -18 to 34 yrs old (46% single) - Women under 45 (36% single)
Should a measure be focused mostly on maintenance projects or include both maintenance as well as capital improvement?	Residents prefer a focus on maintenance over capital projects (62% to 32%)	-18 to 34 yrs old (79% maint.) -Men under 45 (74% maint.) -Women under 45 (69% maint.) -45-59 yrs old (39% capital)
Should a measure earmark money for specific projects or direct money into a general fund?	Residents prefer to earmark money to specific projects so they have stable funding (66% to 30%)	-18 to 34 yrs old (78% earmark) -Women under 45 (73% earmark) -35 to 44 yrs old (36% general)
There was a preference for maintenance over capital projects and ensuring specific projects are funded.		

Q: There are a number of factors that affect the plans we've been discussing. I'd like to ask you about the cost of the plan and what projects are included.

Costs less, \$130/year	48%	51%
Lean to costs less	3%	
Costs more, \$210/year	37%	40%
Lean to costs more	3%	
Neither	7%	
Don't Know	1%	

Every large subgroup (except men) favors the less costly plan by a significant margin. The biggest subgroups:

- Women 56% to 35%
- Seniors 53% to 36%
- SW Region 52% to 42%
- People Unaware of Public Process 54% to 35%

% Favoring Less Costly Plan		
	Favor \$130	Favors \$230

	Plan	Plan
Women Over 40	57%	32%
NE region	57%	35%
35 to 44 yrs old	56%	36%
Women	56%	35%
NW region	54%	36%
People Unaware of Public Process	54%	35%
Overall	51%	40%

% Favoring More Costly Plan		
	Favor \$130 Plan	Favors \$230 Plan
SE region	36%	53%
People Aware of Public Process	48%	49%
Women under 45	53%	48%
Men over 45	45%	48%
Men	46%	47%
Overall	51%	40%

Ms. Peters provided the following points for thinking ahead to next steps:

- Trend in local levies and bonds in Snohomish County since 2008: fewer measures on the ballot and a lower winning percentage.
- Edmonds' last revenue measure (Transportation Benefit District) was just recently on the ballot (November 2010) and lost by a large margin.
- Elections for Council and Mayor in November 2011.
- Not much time between now and August or November 2011.
- High gas prices, local economic conditions not likely to improve significantly.
- Women are increasingly cost sensitive since the recession began and they are 55% of your households.
- Polling indicates support from a small majority...within the margin of error.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked why Ms. Peters focused on the 2009 Levy Committee when there was a 2010 Levy Committee and the Economic Development Commission (EDC). Ms. Peters answered when the questionnaire was written, 2009 was recognized as the starting point of the levy discussions. Staff indicated more significant outreach had occurred in 2009 compared to the work sessions in 2010. Councilmember Buckshnis pointed out the EDC was an outreach group and had done a tremendous amount of work. Ms. Peters answered the focus was on City-sponsored activities.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether the length of a levy was discussed. Ms. Peters answered there are restrictions on what can be discussed in such a poll; polling regarding specifics such as timing, amount, ballot language, etc. cannot be paid for with City funds. In other polls, she has not found that citizens have a strong reaction to the length of a measure; they have stronger opinions about what is funded, cost, etc. Many citizens also do not have an opinion about the timing of a measure and prefer the governing body make that decision.

Mayor Cooper explained he told Ms. Peters the levy discussions began in 2009. She was not provided information regarding the EDC because the poll was specifically regarding the levy.

Council President Peterson explained Councilmember Wilson and he met last week to develop a concept using comments from the public, Council and staff. He reviewed how the Council got to this point:

- Dec 2008: Budget includes a note committing to levy in 2009
- Council forms 2009 levy committee with 60 participants
 - All 8 groups support a levy, ranging in size from \$2.75m to \$4.5m
 - All 8 groups support making economic development a priority
- 2009: Council votes 7 times to support a levy
 - Each vote unanimous
 - Changes direction based on Eyman initiative, FD1 talks, general concern about timing on Nov ballot
- 2010: New levy committee created
- Feb 2011: Council discusses levy at retreat, citizen Darrol Haug outlines possible levy options
- Mar 2011: Mayor announces levy proposal
- April 2011: Levy committee provides mixed feedback
- Public comment: April 26, May 3
- Council deliberations: April 5, 19, 26, May 3

He relayed what the Council has heard from staff:

- Streets: 97% of our streets need repair of some level
- Parks: In last 15 years, added one FTE and decreased seasonal labor, while adding maintenance for 20 new sites
- Buildings: Deferred maintenance, debt payments to ECA
- Police: Item of greatest interest to the citizens

He relayed comments made by the Mayor and Council:

- Mayor: "Critically important to keep our city on a stable financial footing"
- Councilmember Plunkett: "I can support a levy focused on capital and/or maintenance."
- Councilmember Buckshnis: "I'm ready to vote for those things right now (streets, parks, and the ECA)."
- Councilmember Petso: "I think there is unanimous support for some level of funding for streets."
- Councilmember Bernheim: "I'm ready to support putting a levy to the voters, of some size, right now."
- Councilmember Fraley-Monillas: "I supported the TBD because I think our streets need more investment than we currently provide."
- Council President Peterson "We've been talking about a levy for a long time, and all of us agree there is a revenue shortfall. Now it's time to let the voters decide."
- Councilmember Wilson: "I care deeply about getting more cops on the street here, but I am willing to set that aside in order to get broader support for a levy package."

Council President Peterson relayed their proposal:

- Maintenance and Safety Levy
- \$2.75 million
- 4 years
- 2.5% annual increase

Councilmember Wilson explained their proposal was developed after listening to input from the Council and the public in an effort to build as much support from the Council and the public at large as possible.

He assured it was neither his nor Council President Peterson's perfect proposal but it was their attempt at developing a proposal the Council could support. Their proposal would provide:

- \$800,000 – Street Maintenance
- \$900,000 – Parks Maintenance
- \$800,000 – Building Maintenance
- \$250,000 – Police
- \$2.75M – Total

He provided specifics with regard to the funding:

Street Maintenance

- \$800,000 per year
- 100% to street overlays
 - \$15 per square yard, 2" thick (grind and overlay)
 - Goals:
 - Every 15-20 years for arterials
 - Every 30-35 years for residential streets
- This investment level means your street is overlaid every 55 years:
 - Arterials every 28-38 years
 - Residential every 56-65 years

Parks Maintenance

- \$900,000 is a dedicated funding stream for parks maintenance
 - Maintains one of our most important capital assets: our park system
 - Makes investments like:
 - Replaces oldest and most dangerous playground equipment
 - Reestablishes turf integrity for parks so we aren't playing on dirt or dangerous surfaces
 - Yost Pool capital needs are increased and dramatic
 - Fishing pier updates to support tourism: electric, lighting, cleaning station

Building Maintenance

- \$800,000 in dedicated funding
- \$300,000 ECA debt
 - Worst case scenario
 - More information provided at May 17 meeting by ECA Executive Director Joe McIalwain
- Deferred maintenance: \$500,000
 - Frances Anderson Center asbestos abatement - \$50,000
 - Frances Anderson Center radiator replacement - \$110,000
 - Wade James Theater roof replacement - \$50,000

Police

- 1 Uniformed Officer
 - Buys back the officer cut in 2011 budget
 - Cuts since 2008:
 - Lost 2 uniformed officers
 - Lost 1 animal control officer
 - Lost 1 part-time office assistant
 - Lost DARE program
 - Lost School Resource Officer
 - Lost Crime Prevention Unit

- Buys back Crime Prevention Unit
 - Allows for one uniformed officer/analyst
 - Allows for one civilian FTE

Councilmember Wilson summarized their proposal:

- \$2.75 million levy
- \$0.43 per \$1000 of assessed property
- \$161.25/year or \$13.44/month on average home value at \$375,000
- Maintenance and Safety Levy addresses concerns:
 - Mayor: Moves us to a stable financial footing
 - Council: Parks and streets maintenance a priority
 - Public: Buys back public safety cuts
- Most importantly, this is a smart, frugal investing in our capital assets and our community safety

Councilmember Petso commented the parks maintenance amount far exceeded the amount indicated in the information provided by staff in the packet. She asked whether the amount in Councilmember Wilson and Council President Peterson's proposal included wages and benefits for parks maintenance staff. Councilmember Wilson answered there is a parks maintenance budget line item of \$1.45 million. Their proposal would create a dedicated funding source of \$900,000 for parks maintenance. It would increase capital maintenance projects for playground equipment, turf replacement, Yost Pool, etc. Yost Pool is also included in the \$1.45 million line item. The \$900,000 funds capital projects and the difference between \$1.45 million can cover salaries and benefits.

Councilmember Petso asked the same question regarding building maintenance. Councilmember Wilson answered of the \$500,000, \$200,000 is for new projects such as Frances Anderson Center asbestos abatement; the other \$300,000 is for projects identified by Public Works. She asked whether there were funds in that amount allocated to wages and benefits. Councilmember Wilson commented a Councilmember did not control how every dime was spent because that was the Executive's authority; because asphalt did not lay itself and roofs were not put on by themselves, the amount may include wages and benefits. His intent was to focus as much as possible on capital projects.

Mayor Cooper asked staff to clarify how much of the maintenance is performed by City staff versus contracted out. Parks & Recreation Director Carrie Hite explained the information she included in the packet contains a list of park maintenance items; out of the \$1.4 million budget, she estimated \$1.25-1.3 million was labor – benefits and wages. There is a very small budget for supplies and repairs. Many of the projects on the maintenance list are on the list due to limited staffing levels over the past 15 years. Those items total approximately \$330,000. That work can be done by adding one FTE or contracting it out. It is less expensive to add one FTE than contract out the work.

Public Works Director Phil Williams advised overlays would be contracted out to a private sector company, stimulating the economy. There may be minimal City labor for planning and organizing activities. The \$500,000 in building maintenance would be projects like roofs, siding, mechanical systems which are typically contracted out. There would also be some City staff time in building maintenance activities such as painting, small flooring jobs, minor building modifications.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked if the ECA will need \$300,000 for 4 years and how the funds would be used if the economy improves or the ECA sells the naming rights. Councilmember Petso suggested that be answered during next week's presentation by ECA Executive Director Joe McIlwain. She acknowledged the ECA obligation is approximately \$300,000/year. How that is budgeted and how much the ECA can provide is still being worked out. Mayor Cooper advised the \$300,000 is worst case

scenario. Councilmember Buckshnis questioned whether citizens would support an expenditure for which the City did not have exact numbers. Mayor Cooper reiterated the May 17 presentation will provide further information.

As a result of discussions with Mr. Tarte regarding Finance Department staffing, Councilmember Buckshnis suggested adding one FTE to the Finance Department rather than the Police Department. Councilmember Wilson explained the intent of this proposal is to allow the Council and public to speak to it. They intend to move this proposal next week unless there is a different proposal; their proposal can then be amended.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked if consideration had been given to separating the proposals as the survey suggested citizens prefer. Councilmember Wilson answered that is not their proposal; their proposal is 4 years, \$2.75 million with a 2.5%/year increase. He invited Councilmembers to make alternate proposals or amend Council President Peterson's and his proposal. He preferred any significant modifications be done via an independent proposal.

Councilmember Petso expressed her preference for an individual item proposal. She asked whether the plan was to place a levy on the August ballot versus November. She recalled a newspaper article that said there was a cost for an August ballot but no cost for a November ballot. City Clerk Sandy Chase clarified the cost depends on what is on the ballot; the cost is shared by entities with items on the ballot. Both the primary and the general election are a better choice than a special election with regard to cost. Councilmember Petso asked whether the general election was less expensive than the primary. Ms. Chase answered it would depend on the number of issues on the ballot.

Council President Peterson commented the primary driver for putting a levy on the August ballot rather than November is to provide clarity to the budgeting process. If the results of the levy are known before the budget is prepared and presented to the Council the first week of October, the projections can be much more accurate.

Councilmember Wilson commented he is deeply committed to more cops on the street for personal reasons. He is willing to set that aside in an effort to achieve broader support from the Council for a levy proposal. He asked that other Councilmembers have that same open mind. He is unlikely to support 2-5 different ballot propositions because he does not want to pit one line of service against another in this economy. He preferred to have one combined levy.

Councilmember Buckshnis emphasized the City will not run out of money next year; the City does not run out of money until 2014. She knows a lot of people who are unemployed and many seniors have called her to say they do will not support a levy. The Finance Committee met with the Finance Director who agreed the City needs to make its reports more citizen friendly. She anticipated a levy on the August ballot would not provide enough time to educate the public. She preferred 2-3 separate measures to provide citizens a choice.

Councilmember Wilson asked when Councilmember Buckshnis would get to a point that she had enough confidence in the reporting of the numbers that she could ask voters to support a levy. Councilmember Buckshnis referred to the December 31, 2010 quarterly report that has titles not found and overspending on Haines Wharf, emphasizing those issues needed to be resolved because they reflect poorly on the City Council and administration. She did not believe a levy would pass until citizens were provided information. The December 31, 2010 quarterly report on the City's website is a "data dump" that includes amounts with titles not found. The report is an embarrassment and she has asked that it be removed from the City's website. The March 30, 2011 quarterly report is the first report since June 2010 that has made sense.

Council President Peterson recognized that if Councilmember Buckshnis' questions could be answered, the finances would be clearer to everyone. With regard to Councilmember Buckshnis' suggestion for one FTE in the Finance Department versus a Police Officer, he pointed out the need for additional Finance staff to provide clarity before a levy was placed on the ballot. He recalled a motion he made that was not supported by the Council to use funds from the Emergency Reserve to hire a finance person. His primary concern with numerous propositions, a smorgasbord approach, is the high percentage of people that the survey indicated are aware the City needs to shore up its budget. He did not support placing a "shore up the budget" proposition on the ballot that would compete with road, parks and public safety. He expressed concern with waiting to hire a person in Finance until after a levy was approved when that person was needed now to improve financial reporting in preparation for a levy.

Councilmember Bernheim was confident there was no question regarding the accuracy of the reports. He agreed the City needed more user friendly reports which Darrol Haug and Councilmember Buckshnis have made progress toward. At the Finance Committee meeting tonight, Interim Finance Director Jim Tarte explained the City does not have the staff to provide the reports. He preferred not to have new employees included in the levy. Police is not his highest priority; there have been indications that crime is going down and Edmonds is not a high crime area. He preferred to discuss adding police officers during the budget discussions. He supported hiring additional staff for the Finance Department, whether via decreases in other departments or increases in the budget.

Councilmember Bernheim noted the Council came close to placing a levy on the ballot a couple years ago and has made great strides with regard to economic development. The Council established the EDC who has made recommendations to the Council including hiring a consultant to study Westgate and Five Corners. Dick's plans to locate in Edmonds and restaurants and businesses are returning to downtown. He recognized that economic development would not cure the City's or the United States' deficit problem. He was willing to place several propositions on the ballot, explaining that was how government compromised with the citizens. He was also amenable to a combined levy.

With regard to the August or November election, Councilmember Bernheim preferred to place a levy on the November ballot because he believed the City needed a levy. He feared the voters would not approve a levy on the August ballot because the City was not prepared. He preferred to place 2-3 propositions on the November ballot and allow the candidates to talk about it and educate the voters. He feared there would be a small turnout for the August election and then it would be too late to place a levy on the November ballot. A November election will provide time to develop reports which he noted Darrol Haug is in the process of producing because City staff does not have the time to do because they are busy with revenue and expenses and required State reports.

If the Council placed a combined levy on the ballot and it failed, Student Representative Gibson pointed out the City would not receive any money. However, with multiple levy options on the ballot, there is the possibility some will pass. He concluded some money was better than no money.

Councilmember Wilson disagreed with Student Representative Gibson's logic. If he asked Student Representative Gibson for \$100, he might give it to him. If he asked 20 times for \$5, he was guaranteed not to get \$100 from Student Representative Gibson. If the Council needs to ask voters for \$2.75 million for safe streets and playgrounds, the voters should not be asked 2.75 million times. The City needs more staff in Finance, Parks and the Police Department because the Council has not asked the voters for money for years and has underfunded City operations for decades. Now the Council is unable to get the reports they want because there is insufficient staff to prepare them. Citizens cannot get their phone calls answered because there is no staff to take their calls. There will always be a better time and a better way to go to the ballot but at some point the City simply needs to do it. There was a measure on the ballot in

2003 and then it was decided a levy was not needed that year. An EMS levy in 2008 was passed overwhelmingly with 70% approval. A subsequent TBD ballot measure failed miserably. The City has done a stellar job putting off what can be imaged tomorrow. He summarized if not now, when?

Councilmember Petso inquired about her motion last week for \$700,000 for roads. Mayor Cooper recalled that motion was tabled. A subsequent motion by Councilmember Wilson to add \$400,000 for parks maintenance was deferred and then withdrawn at the beginning of tonight's levy discussion.

Council President Peterson explained Councilmember Wilson and his intent was to have staff draft an ordinance with the aforementioned numbers for Council consideration at the May 17 meeting rather than the random motions the Council has made at previous meetings.

Mayor Cooper reported an *Everett Herald* article today stated sales tax in unincorporated Snohomish County is projected to be over \$2 million dollars lower at the end of 2011 than budgeted. Edmonds is on target with 25% collections at the end of the first quarter. Although Councilmember Buckshnis is correct that the City does not use up its reserves until 2014, unless the Council chooses to pass a budget for 2012 that uses more of the reserves, that doesn't keep a one month reserve, the City will be into the one month reserve by \$700,000 in 2012. He urged the Council to consider that as well as declining sales tax and home values when deciding whether to place a levy on the August or November ballot. If the levy is on the November ballot, the 2012 budget he provides the Council in October will reflect the projected shortfall.

Following discussion on action taken on the motions made at last week's meeting, Ms. Chase clarified action taken on motions last week as follows:

- Motion by Councilmember Petso to put a \$700,000 levy on the ballot for street maintenance.
- Amendment by Councilmember Buckshnis to change the amount to \$1.5 million failed.
- Councilmember Wilson restated Councilmember Petso's motion to direct staff to prepare a resolution communicating to the auditor that the City of Edmonds wants to go to the ballot with a \$700,000 Street Levy.
- Amendment by Councilmember Wilson to include \$400,000 for parks maintenance.
- Motion by Councilmember Wilson to postpone amendment to the next meeting approved.
- The motion to amend was withdrawn at the beginning of the discussion of the levy this evening.

Ms. Chase concluded no action was taken on Councilmember Petso's original motion. Mayor Cooper ruled Councilmember Petso's motion was now on the floor for discussion:

COUNCILMEMBER PETSO MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BERNHEIM, TO PUT A \$700,000 LEVY ON THE BALLOT FOR STREET MAINTENANCE.

Councilmember Bernheim expressed his support for the motion and his preference for the November ballot. He preferred the November ballot because it allowed additional time to enhance the public's understanding.

COUNCILMEMBER BERNHEIM MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BUCKSHNIS, TO AMEND TO ADD THAT IT WOULD BE ON THE NOVEMBER BALLOT.

Councilmember Petso commented because this levy funded streets and would not impact the budget process, there was less difficulty with postponing it to November.

Observing there were only five Councilmembers present, Mayor Cooper asked whether four votes, a majority of the Council, or only three votes, a majority of Councilmembers present, were required to pass a motion. City Attorney Jeff Taraday offered to research.

Councilmember Wilson recalled when Councilmember Petso made this motion, it was in an effort to find common ground on which the Council could agree. He asked whether it was her intent to only put a levy for \$700,000 on the ballot or if she had a vision for a more comprehensive strategy. Councilmember Petso recalled the Council stopped last week because it got too late to identify other common grounds.

Councilmember Wilson asked if it was Councilmember Petso's intent to have additional elements as part of a levy package. Councilmember Petso answered she preferred not to add elements to this proposal. She assumed if her proposal passed, other proposals could be made that could be combined or be placed separately on the same or a different ballot. Councilmember Wilson asked if a package could be developed that was a little bigger than Councilmember Petso wanted and smaller than he wanted if they both compromised. Councilmember Petso responded she was unwilling to begin bartering; the survey supports \$700,000 for roads and the Council appeared to agree on that at the previous meeting. Nothing that happened tonight has changed her perspective. She was unable to commit to funding a police officer in an August ballot. Councilmember Wilson answered he was not asking her to do that. This is her motion and he assumed she had a plan. Councilmember Petso assumed other Councilmembers would propose items of importance to them.

With regard to the number of votes to pass a motion, Mr. Taraday explained the vote was not on an ordinance; the votes were on motions that would later be returned to the Council in an ordinance. His understanding is that because it is a motion, a majority of those present, three of the five, is sufficient to pass a motion. Official action to place a levy on the ballot via adoption of a resolution or ordinance would require four votes.

Councilmember Wilson observed the Council had never done that. Mr. Taraday read from an unidentified source, "the basic requirement for adoption of a motion by an assembly with a quorum is a majority vote. Majority is more than half the votes cast by persons legally entitled to vote."

THE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION CARRIED (3-2), COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON AND COUNCILMEMBER WILSON VOTING NO.

Mayor Cooper advised he would allow the motion to pass although he had misgivings about whether the Council could pass a motion with a 3-2 vote.

COUNCILMEMBER WILSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD PARKS MAINTENANCE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$900,000.

Using Councilmember Petso's feedback where she invited other Councilmembers to add to the underlying proposition, Councilmember Wilson felt it appropriate to build toward a proposal like Mayor Cooper's and his and Council President Peterson's proposals.

Councilmember Petso opposed the amendment because there was not yet Council consensus on the parks maintenance item particularly since it includes a variety of items currently funded by REET as well as salaries, wages and benefits. She was uncertain what the parks component should look like but she did not support park maintenance as proposed by Council President Peterson and Councilmember Wilson.

Councilmember Bernheim was supportive of including parks maintenance in a levy proposal but was uncertain what the parks component should look like. He was glad to have the additional time provided

by a November ballot measure to make that determination. By voting no on this proposal tonight, he was not necessarily voting no in the future. He was happy to have items combined in one levy or as separate propositions.

THE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION FAILED (2-3), COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON AND COUNCILMEMBER WILSON VOTING YES.

Councilmember Wilson understood a deficit to be when expenses exceed revenues. His understanding was the City would have a deficit of approximately \$683,000 in 2012. He asked what portion of the \$700,000 in the motion would be used to cover that shortfall. Mr. Tarte answered zero, there would still be an approximately \$700,000 deficit because the \$700,000 in the motion would be used to fund street overlays. It would have no effect on the 2012 deficit and the 2012 budget would still have an approximately \$700,000 deficit.

If the Council chose to fully fund street overlays at \$1.5 million, Councilmember Wilson asked whether any of that new money would cover the shortfall. Mr. Tarte answered no; \$1.5 million would fund street overlays, not shore up the City's finances. Funds need to be included in a levy to shore up the budget in order to cover the deficit. The most recent projection shows the City effectively out of money December 2013. He clarified the end of 2013 shows a balance of \$880,000; that amount would be spent in the first week in January 2014.

Councilmember Wilson commented that scenario would likely never happen because the Mayor will make dramatic cuts to services such as the Yost Pool, senior center programs, and other programs, to ensure the City does not run out of money. If a levy is not placed on the August ballot and approved by the voters, those cuts will begin to be made this summer. Mr. Tarte explained if funds from a levy are not available in August, severe cuts will need to be made in services. In his opinion, from a purely financial point of view, the City would be better off liquidating assets rather than severely cutting services. He cited the City's liquidation of the Fire Department equipment as an example. He summarized the City could get more for its assets if it was not gutted first.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER WILSON, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD BUILDING MAINTENANCE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$800,000.

Councilmember Petso advised she would oppose the amendment for the same reason she opposed the prior amendment. She was hopeful that some of the building maintenance deficit would be REET eligible.

Councilmember Buckshnis stated she will also vote against the amendment. The City will not actually be out of money because there is \$1.9 million in the Emergency Reserve and \$1.3 in the Public Safety Reserve and the City has historically been 3% under budget in salaries and benefits which is not reflected in the forecast. The Council needs to get its hands around the current numbers and forecast accordingly.

Councilmember Wilson explained the \$1.9 million Councilmember Buckshnis referred to is money set aside in the event of a catastrophe such as an earthquake. It is the Council's policy not to spend that on anything other than a tsunami, earthquake, etc. The \$1.3 million was almost spent on a park and the Council is now considering spending it to mitigate medical benefit inflation. None of that money goes to abating asbestos in the Frances Anderson Center as proposed by the amendment. He recognized no other Councilmembers had children that utilized the recreation services provided in the Frances Anderson Center but other families do. He recommended the Council determine a way to fund basic building maintenance by November if they did not choose to do so via this amendment.

Council President Peterson asked how long \$3 million, the \$1.9 million plus \$1.3 million Councilmember Buckshnis referred to, would last if it were moved into the General Fund to support operations. Mr. Tarte answered the levy under consideration is \$2.75 million; \$3 million would take the City through 2015 or 2016. The result of passing a \$2.75 million levy or unrestricting \$3 million was basically the same. It would not address the City's revenue issue; in effect it would be utilizing a \$3 million asset for operations and delaying the current conversation to 2015. Council President Peterson objected to simply "kicking the can down the road."

Council President Peterson recalled he drafted the ordinance restricting the \$1.9 Emergency Reserve Fund. In light of the numerous disasters that have occurred around the world recently, that is a good fund for the City to have. This Council has been adamant that the \$1.3 million in the Public Safety Reserve be used for capital improvements. Unless there was a drastic change in Council policy, he did not understand why those funds were being considered to cover the deficit. If the Council wanted to change that policy and liquidate that asset, that should be discussed prior to a levy. That option has not been raised at the retreat or during any other discussions.

Councilmember Bernheim asked what the \$800,000 would fund. Councilmember Wilson explained the \$800,000 included \$300,000, a worse case scenario funding for the ECA. That amount is likely to be slightly less but not a lot less. The remaining \$500,000 is a dedicated funding source for building maintenance. It secures the existing \$300,000 already in the General Fund for building maintenance and adds \$200,000 for items there is not enough money in REET to cover.

Councilmember Buckshnis expressed her preference for separate ballot propositions rather than bundling levy items. She was unwilling to support \$800,000 until she had more information regarding the ECA debt. She was willing to support \$500,000.

Councilmember Bernheim advised he would support the motion with the understanding he may change some of the details later. In principle he supports putting the ECA debt to the voters whether in a bundled proposition or separate propositions.

THE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION CARRIED (3-2), COUNCILMEMBERS PETSO AND BUCKSHNIS VOTING NO.

COUNCILMEMBER WILSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO INCLUDE \$250,000 FOR POLICE.

Councilmember Wilson explained these funds would buy back one police officer. The City currently has 53 uniformed officers and had 56 in 2008. It will also buy back the Crime Prevention Unit that was cut from the budget by funding one uniformed and one civilian personnel.

THE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION FAILED (2-3), COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON AND COUNCILMEMBER WILSON VOTING YES.

COUNCILMEMBER WILSON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER BERNHEIM, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO INCREASE THE LEVY AMOUNT BY \$1 MILLION TO FUND THE DEFICIT AND SHORE UP THE BUDGET FOR THE NEXT 4 YEARS.

Councilmember Bernheim advised he will support the amendment because it allows the voters to decide. He viewed this as a good topic for a levy. He was open to a combined levy or separate levy propositions.

Councilmember Petso advised she will vote against the amendment as well as her original motion as it appears the items are being bundled into one levy.

UPON ROLL CALL, THE VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT CARRIED (3-2), COUNCILMEMBERS BERNHEIM AND WILSON AND COUNCIL PRESIDENT PETERSON VOTING YES; AND COUNCILMEMBERS PETSO AND BUCKSHNIS VOTING NO.

Mayor Cooper restated the motion with amendments as follows:

TO PUT A LEVY ON THE NOVEMBER BALLOT WITH \$700,000 FOR STREET OVERLAYS, \$800,000 FOR BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND \$1 MILLION TO FUND THE DEFICIT.

Councilmember Wilson stated that there was no funds for cops in the motion, that it would be on the November ballot, that there were no funds for park maintenance but he was willing to support the motion because at a bare minimum it adds some investments and shores up the budget. This is far from a perfect levy proposal and is a bitter, painful pill but he argued it was as bitter for him as anyone else. If the Council was unable to get consensus on this compromise, he was doubtful the Council would reach consensus on anything. He pointed out this meets Councilmember Petso more than halfway, funds what Councilmember Buckshnis has said she wants to fund and funds a few of the things he wants to fund. He urged the Council to support the motion and bring this levy proposal back for public comment next week.

Councilmember Petso did not support the motion. There was no way that within an hour of hearing about asbestos in the Frances Anderson Center that she would support funds for building maintenance. She noted there would be public comment next week and an opportunity to vote on a final ordinance, providing the Council time to make improvements.

Councilmember Buckshnis commented the ECA debt had increased from \$100,000 to \$300,000 and she has no details. She reiterated the need to shore up the City's financials to improve citizens' understanding.

Councilmember Bernheim commented it was not his objective to sour the basic roads proposal. He also did not want to be pigeon holed into maintaining the positions he supported tonight in a final ordinance. He would support the motion with the understanding there would be further public comment and opportunity for additional modifications.

THE VOTE ON THE MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED (3-2), COUNCILMEMBERS BUCKSHNIS AND PETSO VOTING NO.

Mayor Cooper advised he will work with staff and Mr. Taraday to prepare an ordinance for Council consideration next week. The ordinance will be drafted so that it can be amended. He suggested Councilmembers with amendments provide them to Mr. Taraday to allow him to draft appropriate language. It is not as critical to have the ordinance perfected next week as the motion directed the levy be placed on the November ballot. He acknowledged the ordinance could be amended to place the levy on the August ballot.

Council President Peterson advised ECA Executive Director Joe McIlwain will make a presentation to the Council at next week's meeting. Also at the May 17 meeting, Councilmember Wilson will provide a summary of the self-insurance process.

4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Al Rutledge, Edmonds, relayed a news report regarding a shooting at Edmonds-Woodway High School today and the subsequent lock down of five schools as a precaution. Next, he encouraged the public to visit the Farmers Market on Saturday. He agreed with plans to make cuts if voters did not approve a levy.

He advised although property values have declined, property taxes in Snohomish County have increased. With regard to the levy, he asked whether the rate would be fixed for 4 years.

Ron Wambolt, Edmonds, questioned the Council's comment that the levy proposal may be changed based on audience comment when the Council did not pay any attention to the poll which was well done and objective. With regard to a smorgasbord levy, he asked the Snohomish County Auditor whether that was possible. They responded that was very complex and recommended he confer with the City Attorney. He referred to Mayor Cooper's comment at last week's meeting, it is clear by Mr. Wambolt's comments that the silly season has arrived, it's election season. Mr. Wambolt asked Mayor Cooper to identify what he said that was incorrect; Mayor Cooper may disagree with his opinions but his facts were correct. Mayor Cooper also stated that concessions have already been made by employees and to illustrate, he said merit pay increases have been reduced from 3% to 1.5 %. To most people concessions mean compensation was temporarily reduced; the only temporary reduction was in 2009. A Councilmember said last week that the current labor contract negotiations could yield some pleasant news; with compensation comprising 52% of total expenses, he recommended the scope of a levy be delayed until after labor negotiations are complete. He recognized the City needed a levy but would not support a levy until expenses were reduced.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, referred to the comment that the City would be out of money by 2014, suggesting the Council start cutting costs. He feared there would be no change even if a levy passed because the primary increase was in salaries, wages and benefits. The current levy proposal provides funds for building maintenance and other things but does not solve the labor and benefit problem. Next, he commented that in a bad economy private business either raises its prices or it reduces hours, reduces staff and cuts prices. He disagreed with the Council's choice to raise prices via a levy. He referred to Snohomish County's anticipated decline in sales tax revenue and subsequent 2.6% reduction in expenses to cover the shortfall. He suggested Mayor Cooper make similar reductions in expenses. His family participated in the survey and he found there were too many questions, the survey was too long, questions were confusing and he did not have enough information regarding some concepts such as the strategic plan, the City remaining true to its values and shoring up the budget. He suggested in the future a survey be shorter and would be less expensive.

5. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Cooper clarified there was no shooting at Edmonds-Woodway High School. The School was put in lockdown because the Police received a 911 call that there was possibly a shooting. The Edmonds Police Department responded and was on scene in three minutes and made a decision to search the school and lock down Edmonds-Woodway High School, College Place Elementary School, College Place Middle School, and Chase Lake Elementary School. After searching the school it was determined that nothing had happened at the school. School administrators confirmed nothing had happened and thanked the Police Department for responding appropriately. It has since been determined that the 911 call was a hoax.

6. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Wilson reported Council President Peterson, Mayor Cooper and he attended the Climate Solutions breakfast. The City partners with Climate Solutions to advance clean energy solutions and efficiency. Mayor Cooper, Councilmember Petso and he attended the Regional Fire Authority meeting in Lynnwood last week. On Thursday Parks & Recreation Director Carrie Hite and he are meeting with a group to explore a public-private partnership for a year-round facility at Yost Pool. He also planned to attend the Cascade Land Conservancy breakfast on Thursday. He remarked the Council has been talking

about a levy since 2008 and anticipated if he is still on the Council in four years, the Council will still be talking about it.

Councilmember Bernheim explained the Council would be talking about levies every couple of years because that was how the Tim Eyman law worked; the new paradigm in local government is the City Council cannot pass tax increases; property taxes can only increase 1% per year, therefore the Council must ask voters for any additional increases. The City tries to keep the cost of government increasing at 1% per year just like the public tries to keep their family budget from increasing more than 1% per year. He anticipated the number of families who were successful at keeping their budgets from increasing more than 1% was quite low unless difficult cuts were being made or assets were being liquidated. He looked forward to public comment on the current levy proposal. He was uncomfortable with the poll and did not think it was necessary to spend that kind of money to ask questions of voters; that is the Council's role in local government.

Councilmember Petso referred to Mr. Rutledge's question regarding a 4 year levy, observing the current levy proposal does not specify a duration. When she made the original motion, it was her understanding it was a 3-year levy; however, now at least two of the three who supported tonight's levy proposal have presented a 4-year levy.

Councilmember Buckshnis explained she is interested in funding for parks maintenance. Mayor Cooper's levy proposal had \$275,000 for parks compared to Councilmember Wilson and Council President Peterson's proposal that included \$900,000 for parks. She referred to Councilmember Wilson's statement on March 15 that he did not support the 2011 budget or any amendments because he did not believe the financials, pointing out nothing that changed since that time. March 2011 is the first time anything substantial has been provided. Councilmember Wilson responded there is a new Mayor and a new Finance Director.

Council President Peterson read an email from a civil engineer working on the Panera Bread project that will convert the existing Barlee's Restaurant into a new café and bakery with a drive through lane. The letter stated there are a lot of design issues on the project and he has been working with Jeanie McConnell on storm runoff issues. He complimented her knowledge, professionalism and courtesy, stating she has gone out of her way to help him and his client understand the City's codes, explore different options, answer design questions and follow up with other members of staff when code determinations were needed. At a time when many municipalities are either unwilling or unable to take the time to assist developers, Jeanie has been the exception. It is a refreshing change to work with someone who listens to concerns, asks questions and not just say read the code. Council President Peterson thanked Ms. McConnell and other 2nd Floor staff for doing a job that is crucial to economic development in the City.

7. ADJOURN

With no further business, the Council meeting was adjourned at 9:59 p.m.